

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Other</u>
A 1	1	5	--	--
2	1	4	--	1 No Answer
2 a	-	6	--	--
2 b	1	5	--	--
2 c	6	-	--	--
2 d	-	4	--	2 Questionable
3	-	3	--	2 No Answer 1 ?
4	4	2	--	--
4 a	2	4	--	--
4 b	6	-	--	--
5	-	4	--	2 No Answer
5 a	-	6	--	--
5 b	-	6	--	--
6	1	5	--	--
6 a	5	-	1	--
6 b	4	2	--	--
7	1	4	--	1 Questionable
7 a	1	5	--	--
8	6	-	--	--
8 a	-	1	--	2 Questionable 2 No Answer 1 Difficult to tell
8 b	-	-	6	--
9	-	-	6	--
10	2	-	3	1 No Answer
11	6	-	--	--
11 a	1	5	--	--
11 b	1	5	--	--
11 c	-	6	--	--
11 d	-	5	--	1 No Answer
12	6	-	--	--
13	5	1	--	--
14	2	2	--	2 Probably
15	5	-	1	--
15 a	5	-	1	--
Totals	72	90	18	18

TENTATIVE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION FORM

A. Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", or Not Applicable.

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory as is?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Can you now accomplish a new job?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) An old job easier?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) An old job faster?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) An old job more accurately?			<i>Questionable</i>
3) Would its training time outweigh its eventual advantages?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4) Is equipment comfortable to use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Seating position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Viewing position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Eye fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Muscular fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6) Is the intensity of illumination adequate?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Is the color of illumination pleasing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Is glare a problem?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
7) Is resolution adequate?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Is the magnification range broad enough?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
8) Is the field of view large enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Is the image's shape distorted?			<i>Difficult to tell</i>
b) Is its color aberrated?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9) Is the operating temperature low enough?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10) Is this machine of sufficient durability for its potential working environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
11) Are the controls satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Too hard to reach?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Too hard to identify?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) Would you prefer a greater degree of control automation (more buttons rather than handwheels, joysticks, etc.)?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) A lesser degree?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
12) Can the same job be performed better on an existing instrument?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, one which one? 			
13) Is any operation too time-consuming?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, which one(s)? <i>Loading + Unloading</i>			
14) Is this instrument too complex?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, in what way? <i>Needs a trained operator</i>			
15) Is pointing easy enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Is the reticle satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If not, how not?			

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development, if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.

2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?

I feel that the machine is too complex to serve the normal needs of the PI and too time consuming.

TENTATIVE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION FORM

A. Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", or Not Applicable.

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory as is?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Can you now accomplish a new job?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) An old job easier?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) An old job faster?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) An old job more accurately?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3) Would its training time outweigh its eventual advantages?			
4) Is equipment comfortable to use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Seating position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Viewing position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?			
a) Eye fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Muscular fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6) Is the intensity of illumination adequate?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Is the color of illumination pleasing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Is glare a problem?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7) Is resolution adequate?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Is the magnification range broad enough?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
8) Is the field of view large enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Is the image's shape distorted?			
b) Is its color aberrated?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9) Is the operating temperature low enough?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10) Is this machine of sufficient durability for its potential working environment?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11) Are the controls satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Too hard to reach?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Too hard to identify?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) Would you prefer a greater degree of control automation (more buttons rather than handwheels, joysticks, etc.)?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) A lesser degree?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
12) Can the same job be performed better on an existing instrument?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, one which one? 			
13) Is any operation too time-consuming?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, which one(s)? LOADING			
14) Is this instrument too complex?			
If so, in what way? PROBABLY			
15) Is pointing easy enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Is the reticle satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If not, how not? 			

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development, if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.

2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?

A. Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", or Not Applicable.

NOT APPLICABLE

- Not Applicable.
- 1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory as is?
 - 2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?
 - a) Can you now accomplish a new job?
 - b) An old job easier?
 - c) An old job faster?
 - d) An old job more accurately?
 - 3) Would its training time outweigh its eventual advantages?
 - 4) Is equipment comfortable to use?
 - a) Seating position comfortable?
 - b) Viewing position comfortable?
 - 5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?
 - a) Eye fatigue?
 - b) Muscular fatigue?
 - 6) Is the intensity of illumination adequate?
 - a) Is the color of illumination pleasing?
 - b) Is glare a problem?
 - 7) Is resolution adequate?
 - a) Is the magnification range broad enough?
 - 8) Is the field of view large enough?
 - a) Is the image's shape distorted?
 - b) Is its color aberrated?
 - 9) Is the operating temperature low enough?
 - 10) Is this machine of sufficient durability for its potential working environment?
 - 11) Are the controls satisfactory?
 - a) Too hard to reach?
 - b) Too hard to identify?
 - c) Would you prefer a greater degree of control automation (more buttons rather than handwheels, joysticks, etc.)?
 - d) A lesser degree?
 - 12) Can the same job be performed better on an existing instrument?

If so, one which one? _____
 - 13) Is any operation too time-consuming?

If so, which one(s)? loading
 - 14) Is this instrument too complex?

If so, in what way? _____
 - 15) Is pointing easy enough?
 - a) Is the reticle satisfactory?

If not, how not? _____

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development, if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.
2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?

TENTATIVE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION FORM

A. Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", or Not Applicable.

1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory as is?

2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?

a) Can you now accomplish a new job?

b) An old job easier?

c) An old job faster?

d) An old job more accurately?

3) Would its training time outweigh its eventual advantages?

4) Is equipment comfortable to use?

a) Seating position comfortable?

b) Viewing position comfortable?

5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?

a) Eye fatigue?

b) Muscular fatigue?

6) Is the intensity of illumination adequate?

a) Is the color of illumination pleasing?

b) Is glare a problem?

7) Is resolution adequate?

a) Is the magnification range broad enough?

8) Is the field of view large enough?

a) Is the image's shape distorted?

b) Is its color aberrated?

9) Is the operating temperature low enough?

10) Is this machine of sufficient durability for its potential working environment?

11) Are the controls satisfactory?

a) Too hard to reach?

b) Too hard to identify?

c) Would you prefer a greater degree of control automation (more buttons rather than handwheels, joysticks, etc.)?

d) A lesser degree?

12) Can the same job be performed better

25X1 on an existing instrument?

If so, one which one?

13) Is any operation too time-consuming?

If so, which one(s)?

14) Is this instrument too complex?

If so, in what way?

15) Is pointing easy enough?

a) Is the reticle satisfactory?

If not, how not?

YES

NO

NOT APPLICABLE

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development, if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.

2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?

TENTATIVE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION FORM

A. Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", or Not Applicable.

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory as is?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Can you now accomplish a new job?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) An old job easier?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c) An old job faster?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) An old job more accurately?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3) Would its training time outweigh its eventual advantages?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4) Is equipment comfortable to use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Seating position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Viewing position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a) Eye fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b) Muscular fatigue?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6) Is the intensity of illumination adequate?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (flickers)	
a) Is the color of illumination pleasing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Is glare a problem?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7) Is resolution adequate?			<i>quest</i>
a) Is the magnification range broad enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
8) Is the field of view large enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<i>quest.</i>
a) Is the image's shape distorted?			<i>NA</i>
b) Is its color aberrated?			<i>NA</i>
9) Is the operating temperature low enough?			
10) Is this machine of sufficient durability for its potential working environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
11) Are the controls satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Too hard to reach?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Too hard to identify?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
c) Would you prefer a greater degree of control automation (more buttons rather than handwheels, joysticks, etc.)?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d) A lesser degree?			
12) Can the same job be performed better 25X1 on an existing instrument?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, one which one?			
13) Is any operation too time-consuming?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, which one(s)? <i>loading/unloading</i>			
14) Is this instrument too complex?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If so, in what way? <i>Need trained operator</i>			
15) Is pointing easy enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
a) Is the reticle satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
If not, how not?			

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development, if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.
2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?

1. Questionable if this machine can be used reliably for small measurements.
2. Can it give scale bet. two points or in a given direction?

TENTATIVE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION FORM

A. Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", or Not Applicable.

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory as is?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Can you now accomplish a new job?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) An old job easier?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) An old job faster?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) An old job more accurately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Would its training time outweigh its eventual advantages?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Is equipment comfortable to use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Seating position comfortable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Viewing position comfortable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Eye fatigue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Muscular fatigue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Is the intensity of illumination adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Is the color of illumination pleasing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Is glare a problem?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Is resolution adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Is the magnification range broad enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) Is the field of view large enough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Is the image's shape distorted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is its color aberrated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9) Is the operating temperature low enough?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10) Is this machine of sufficient durability for its potential working environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11) Are the controls satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Too hard to reach?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Too hard to identify?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Would you prefer a greater degree of control automation (more buttons rather than handwheels, joysticks, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A lesser degree?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12) Can the same job be performed better on an existing instrument?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If so, one which one? <u>Chip Comparator</u>			
13) Is any operation too time-consuming?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If so, which one(s)?			
14) Is this instrument too complex?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If so, in what way?			
15) Is pointing easy enough?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Is the reticle satisfactory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If not, how not?			

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development, if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.
2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

IAD/OSS-138/66
9 May 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Plans and Development, NPIC

ATTENTION:

[REDACTED]

25X1A

FROM:

Chief, Imagery Analysis Division, CIA

SUBJECT:

[REDACTED] Film Reader Model 265 - Drawings

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

1. Per your request of 18 March 1966, Memorandum, P&DS/D/SSS/6-18 we have reviewed the drawings submitted by the Division of [REDACTED] under [REDACTED]

25X1A

25X1

2. Although [REDACTED] appears to have performed a creditable job in designing a production model film reader which would resolve problems encountered in the prototype [REDACTED] viewer, current IAD responsibilities do not require utilization of an instrument of this type. We do not, therefore, recommend production of the Model 265 at this time unless its use is required by the NPIC/PAG.

25X1A

3. Should a device of this type become an integral part of any future "chip selection" system we would, of course, wish to re-evaluate this proposal.

4. We appreciate the opportunity of participating in this evaluation, and are returning the subject drawings with this memorandum.

25X1A

[REDACTED]

Attachment

Subject Drawings

Distribution

Original - Addressee

2 - OSS/IAD

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

SECRET

Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

SECRET

IPO/OSB/M-131-66
30 March 1966

25X1A

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Plans and Development, NPIC

ATTENTION n

:

[REDACTED]

SUBJECT

:

Comments on [REDACTED] Film Reader

25X1A

1. In response to your request to evaluate the engineering drawings and specifications for the new film reader, the PAG has found it impossible to review the box of engineering drawings submitted but the "System Description and Specifications #265" has been read and comments made in pencil near the statement to which it refers.

2. In reading the system description there seems to be no great change in operating procedures over what is now available in the prototype. One exception to this however is the film or leader loading which has been automated. According to the description of this however, it still is not a proven system operation that can be depended upon. More work should be done on operator convenience and simplification of procedures.

3. A memorandum evaluating the use of the present [REDACTED] Reader/Viewer prototype will be forthcoming next week from PAG. This paper lists advantages and disadvantages, and recommendations concerning use of the instrument and additional computer data which would aid the photointerpreter.

25X1A

4. It would be appreciated if the questions indicated in the comments on the "System Description and Specifications #265" were answered and forwarded to PAG. It is further suggested that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] have a discussion of the concept and operation of the new [REDACTED] Reader/Viewer.

25X1A

25X1A


25X1A

25X1A

[REDACTED]

Assistant for Photographic Analysis, NPIC

SECRET



Memo
From

25X1A

[Redacted box]

R.Y.N.

Where is the copy of the
"System Description and Specifications
265" in which they have made
the pencil comments. Jerry has
not received it in action can
be taken on answering the
questions until it is received.
A meeting has been set up for
Thursday PM to discuss the
operation.

JK

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

797270

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

NPIC/P&DS/D/6-844
22 March 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Photographic Analysis, NPIC

SUBJECT: Rear Projection Reader Development

1. In an effort to increase the photo interpreters' capability through automation, P&DS has been pursuing the design and development of high resolution rear projection readers for rapidly scanning and accurately measuring images within any single frame on large volumes of roll photography. In addition, it is anticipated that the readers will also serve as semi-automatic chip selection and reproduction requisition devices for the proposed NPIC Chip System.

25X1A

2. As a result of this development effort, the prototype Variable Width Film Reader (VWFR) prototype has been delivered and placed in operation in your facility. It must be understood that in the development of this prototype, the primary concern was one of increasing the state-of-the-art and demonstrating the feasibility of the reader concept. Little emphasis was placed on the human engineering or reliability aspects since any follow-on procurement would most likely necessitate redesign based upon the evaluation of the prototype. Whereas a prototype such as the VWFR logically should be placed in a test and evaluation area independent of operational considerations, it was placed in your spaces due to the lack of a test and evaluation component within the Center.

25X1A

3. In addition to the VWFR prototype, a follow-on production engineering study has just been completed. The objective of this study was to eliminate the undesirable features of the prototype, provide additional capabilities, and reduce production unit cost without compromising the performance of the equipment. As a result of this study, a complete set of engineering design drawings and associated report has been forwarded to your staff for review and comment.

4. Based upon your evaluation of the prototype and the engineering design drawings, it is requested that you advise P&DS of your production requirements for additional readers.

25X1A

Assistant for Plans and Development, NPIC

Distribution:

Original and 1 - Addressee

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

NPIC/P&DS/DB:

10 March 66

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

NPIC/P&DS/D/6-

3 March 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Photo Analysis Group

SUBJECT: Rear Projection Readers

1. P&DS has been pursuing the development and design of high resolution rear projection readers in an endeavor to provide photointerpreters with a capability for rapidly scanning large volumes of photography with an accurate measuring ability.

2. Techniques such as image quenching, electromagnetic controlling effects and ultra-violet transparent fluorescent coatings are being investigated. Chemical and electro-chemical screen development using ultra-violet illumination to excite an organic coated screen with improved resolution has been proven feasible.

25X1A 3. The ☐ Variable Width Film Reader (prototype) has been ~~operational~~ and successfully operated, on a limited basis, by both PAG and IAD and proven useful for scanning and measurement operations. *the theory*

An engineering study with detailed drawings of a production type reader has been completed and is available for reviewing and editing.

4. In view of the fact that the chip concept *ph* may be adapted by NPIC this office recommends serious consideration be given to the production design reader because of its ~~XYZ~~ ^{XX Az} measuring capability necessary for chip selection.

5. It is imperative at this point in time that P&DS receives direction from PAG as to the course of action desired in the area of rear projection readers.

25X1A

☐

Assistant for Plans and Development, NPIC

2. As a result of the development efforts PRDS has provided NPIC with a prototype rear projection reader which has been fully operated, ~~on a limited basis by both PAG + IAD. The theory of rear projection readers.~~ As a follow on PRDS has completed an engineering study with detailed drawings of a production type reader which is available for reviewing or editing.

3. Further direction on the development and purchase of a production type rear

projection reader must now come from operational units.

In view of the fact that the chip concept may be adopted by NPIC this office recommends consideration be given to the production design reader XXA2 measuring capability for chip selection.

ILLEGIB

This memo is a request for YAG to review their requirements for rear projection readers and advise ~~PPPS~~ ~~for~~ ~~course of action.~~ ~~PPPS~~

3rd Try

Memo for Photo Interpretation
Subject: Rear Projection Readers.

1) P&DS has been pursuing the development and design of high resolution rear projection readers in an endeavor to provide photo interpreters with a capability for rapidly scanning large volumes of photography with an accurate measuring ability.

ILLEGIB

2) As a result of the development [] P&DS has provided NPIC with a prototype rear projection reader. A follow on study has been completed providing detailed engineering design drawings which are available for review or editing.

25X1A

3) On the basis of the evaluation now being performed in the [] Variable [] Film Reader it is requested that P&G review their requirements for a rear projection reader and advise P&DS as to further course of action.

- 1) We Perseued T6 development
- 2) We had a proto type built.
- 3) It is being evaluated.
- 4) Based on this evaluation do you want one.

SECRET
(When Filled In)

997 295

25X1	SPEED LETTER	REPLY REQUESTED		DATE
		YES	NO	LETTER NO.

TO : NPIC	25X1A	FROM:	25X1A
ATTN:			

Subject:

25X1A

- 1 Attached, find Contractor's letter, dated 12/10/65, which refers to the delivery of one (1) set of manufacturing drawings. This set of drawings is now in this Station's possession. It comprises two ~~small~~ small boxes.
- 2 Deliverable Items 2 - call out 5 each of Manufacturing Drawings.
- 3 Please indicate whether or not the Technical Office has received 4 sets, and whether or not the Technical Office has need for the set now in our possession. If no need exists for the fifth set, we will destroy it.

REPLY	DATE
	11/7/66

25X1A

- 1) we received one set of engineering drawings (12/27/65) on contract contained in one box.
- 2) No report or explanation was included with the drawings.
- 3) we could use the set of drawings you have in your possession.

25X1A

SECRET
(When Filled In)

997295

SPEED LETTER 25X1A	REPLY REQUESTED		DATE 2-17-66
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO	LETTER NO. 954-439

TO : NPIC - P&DD

FROM:

ATTN:

254

25X1A

Please issue final inspection
Report if all deliverable items
have been satisfactorily received

25X1A

SIGNATURE

REPLY

DATE

7 March 1966

25X1

All deliverable items have been received. The contractor has
satisfactorily completed .. final inspection report has
been issued and will be sent through normal channels.

25X1A

SIGNATURE

RESPONDER'S FILE

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0

Next 5 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2002/11/01 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001300030005-0